

Progressive Calvinism

© *Progressive Calvinism League, 1956*

VOLUME II

SEPTEMBER, 1956

NUMBER 9

Contents

	Page
The Idea Or Theme Of This Issue	258
Max Weber, Sociologist	259
Tawney's Foreword To Weber's Book	265
Are Calvinists Prosperous?	269
What Is Capitalism?	271
What Is The Protestant Ethic?	
A. In Regard To The Antithesis	273
B. In Regard To Calling In Life	276
C. In Regard To The Glory Of God	278
D. In Regard To Loving Neighbor	283
Evaluation Of Weber's Thesis On Calvinism And Capitalism	287

Published monthly by Progressive Calvinism League; founders: Frederick Nymeyer, John Van Mouwerik and Martin B. Nymeyer. Responsibility for articles assumed by author only. Annual subscription rate: students, \$1.00; others, \$2.00. Bound copy of 1955 issues: students, \$1.00; others, \$2.00. Send subscriptions to Progressive Calvinism League, 366 East 166th Street, South Holland, Illinois, U. S. A.

The Idea Or Theme Of This Issue:

Progressive Calvinism Is A "Throwback" To Traditional Calvinism

We have previously written that although we are *progressive* Calvinists we are not "modern" Calvinists.

We are *progressive* in the sense of utilizing findings of the praxeological sciences (that is, the social sciences, viewing them individualistically* without the intellectual narrowness of viewing them *only* from a *social* aspect). These praxeological sciences are history, political science, economics, sociology, etc., and partial aspects of other sciences as psychology, physiology, etc. We relate the finding of those sciences with primitive Christianity.

Many modern Calvinists are different; they are not, as we see it, progressive. They are not traditional Calvinists either; the adjustment of their "Calvinism" to the modern environment has consisted in conforming more and more to the "world" and the supplementing of their religion with ideas not from rigorously logical "science" but from *ideologies*.

Ideologies, by Marxian definition, are not really true, but are biassed systems of thought. Karl Marx, founder of modern socialism-communism, denied objective truth. All systems of thought, he declared, have a selfish, subjective bias, as the bias of an aristocrat, or a bourgeois, or a capitalist, etc. All such ideologies are basically dishonest (Marx said), except *one* ideology — his own, of course; that really honest and universal ideology of his own was the ideology of the proletariat (a proletarian is a man who has no capital); and so it is or should be the ideology of *all* men. Lenin, Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini** were all professed Marxists and were adherents of Marx's proletarian and honest (?) ideology; fine exemplars they of the only universal and true system of ethics!

*See December, 1955, issue of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM, pages 341-347.

**Mussolini did not abandon Marxist principles when he became a guild socialist (syndicalist, the corporative state) along the lines favored by, among others, the so-called Christian labor organizations.

The ideas which are presently promoted in denominational schools as being the new zenith and the true essence of Christianity, (or of one of its branches, Calvinism) — ideas for example regarding compulsory desegregation and the *moral* obligation to desegregate — such ideas are the *new* religion in departments as in the sociology departments of Christian colleges. The essence of the principles of social service and welfare work taught are basically unhinged from *traditional* Christian ethics. (Naturally, what is taught is alleged or implied to be Christian ethics, but it is basically the ethics of Marxism, a superpiusness which requires that you love your neighbor *more than* yourself. Further, it is exceedingly reactionary, going back to medieval idealisms of various kinds.)

As we wrote in the October 1955 issue, page 283, under the title, "We Line Up With Sixteenth Century Dutch Calvinists Rather Than Modern Dutch Calvinists," we are "ideologically" far closer to sixteenth and seventeenth century Calvinists than to some twentieth century Calvinists. We are, as geneticists and livestock breeders would say, "throwbacks" to the great Reformation in the Netherlands and the great Puritan movement in England and the United States. That is, we are basically throwbacks, *except* for our progressivism which we have just mentioned.

This idea, that we are *traditional* Calvinists, has struck us with renewed force while reading recently for the first time two works of Max Weber, entitled *The Protestant Ethic And The Spirit of Capitalism* and *General Economic History*. We have sat back after reading these books and marvelled how PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM is in the Calvinist tradition, and how far some in Christian Reformed church have departed from that tradition. fn

Max Weber, Sociologist

Sociology is the youngest of the praxeological sciences (social sciences). It also comes closest to being a pseudo-science of any of the praxeological sciences.

Two of the reasons why sociology is such a dubious science is because (1) its foundation is so inadequate and (2) its pretense is so great.

1. Firstly, the reason why its foundation is inadequate is because it concerns itself with one thing only, towit:

a. The relation of men to men.

It completely ignores two other relationships, which in PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM we carefully keep in mind, namely:

b. The relation of men to God, and

c. The relation of men to things*

Some of our nonreligious readers will shrug off our attention to the "relation of men to God." Some of our hyper-pious readers will shrug off our attention to the "relation of men to things." Despite the dissent from both of these groups we consider all three of the subjects we have mentioned to be part of a unified and coherent system of thought. That system of thought makes, we believe, more "sense" than any other system, whether it be the system of an agnostic who rejects attention to the relationship of men to a supreme Being, or of a sociologist who fails to understand or take into account the relationship of men to things.

If neither Adam nor his descendents had ever sinned there would not be pressure (coercion) of men on men, but there would still have been pressure of things on men (the welfare shortage). That is why economics is an essential ingredient of sound praxeology, and a necessary antecedent of sound sociology.

But the sociologists have historically in a notorious manner been ignorant of economics. In this they have followed Comte, the founder of sociology. Not only are they generally ignorant of economics, they are hostile to economics; their ideas of the relation of men to men are warped by their neglect of the relation of men to things. They consequently often confuse the pressure (coercion) of circumstances (things) with something else, namely, the coercion of men by men.

Not understanding either *nature* or the *law* they talk of *common grace* and *brotherly love* respectively in unrealistic and ab-

*See July 1956 issue, page 195 and following.

stracted senses. Ideas in regard to grace and love should be fitted to reality. Whoever gets his ideas of the nature of reality from a typical sociologist, will have a distorted view of life.

The poorest way to approach praxeology is from the viewpoint of sociologists. In recent years in Christian Reformed circles (as elsewhere) sociology has become popular as the approach to an "advance" in Christian ethics. Our view is that a typical sociological approach is certain to end in deterioration, if not subversion, of Biblical ethics.

The new popularity of sociology is universal; the crown princess of the Netherlands is this Fall entering college and is reported in newspapers to be intending to specialize in sociology. The sense of values in the royal house of the Netherlands is, we concede, popular.

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM's ideas in the field of nature and law are different from the ideas of common grace and love as taught in denominational colleges, or as in Union Theological Seminary in New York City, or in the pronouncements of the World Council of Churches. This subject is too comprehensive to be discussed further here.

2. Secondly, there is that other feature about sociology which readers should note; sociology pretends it is not "normative" but merely descriptive. We in PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM have a norm, a standard. We make no apology for that. We do not deny that we have a "viewpoint," and that acceptance of a viewpoint automatically has an effect on everything. Our norm, our standard is the Law of God. We are not "pure scientists" who only describe and who only talk "facts." We lack that pretended qualification of sociologists. We cannot in good conscience, for example, tell our readers what Professor Donald H. Bouma, head of the sociology department at Calvin College has been reported to have told to new students from the grass roots of Michigan, Wisconsin, California, etc., in his first lecture in a course, to the effect that in that course in sociology pure science is to be taught, just *facts*. (These facts are statistics of some sort!) Instead, we

openly accept certain *values*. For us there are no such things as "brute facts." We are plodding propagandists for a set of *values* known through the Decalogue.

There are then (besides others) two fundamental and irreconcilable differences between sociology and PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM, namely, we have a triple base (the relation of men to God, other men and things) rather than a single base (the relation of men to men only), and we openly admit we are not "scientists" in the sense of the positivism of Comte, the founder of sociology, who declared that "Science is measurement," that is, it is only description and excludes values.

Max Weber, whose ideas we shall consider in this issue, was born at Erfurt, Germany (where Luther went to college) in 1864. He died fifty-six years later in 1920. Weber is, therefore, to be considered as a man who belongs to the present age.

Weber's father was a prosperous politician. The son first studied law. But his real interest, especially toward the end of his life, was sociology and social philosophy. In encyclopedias Weber is alternately described as a social economist or as a sociologist.

Weber served as professor at Berlin (1893), Freiburg (1894) and at Munich (1918). He also had a connection or lectured at Heidelberg. He visited the United States and made a speech in Saint Louis, Missouri. During a considerable part of his life Weber was afflicted with ill health. After World War I he participated in some of the peace conferences. His ideas had a large influence on the National Socialist party of his day.

The *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* says:

As defined by Weber sociology is concerned with the social activities of human beings, that is, with activities oriented to those of others.

As we said earlier, sociology pertains to the relation of men to men, or as it is stated here: "activities oriented to those of others."

The same article on Weber declares about him (our italics):

[Weber] ascribed to science the task of intensifying the awareness of *conflict* and thereby im-

parting to the active individual a stronger sense of responsibility based upon that consciousness that in the pursuit of his own values he must *inevitably infringe upon the values of others*.

Instead of considering life a natural *conflict* and social life as causing inevitable mutual injury as Weber is here said to have done, PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM looks on social life as naturally peaceful and cooperative (and not warfare) but marred by sin — that is, marred by disobeying the Decalogue. There is a great difference in those two viewpoints, and readers may be sure that the premises of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM are genuinely to be preferred as being in accordance with reality.

Weber's famous publications give evidence that he was a hard worker and had great abilities. How he could have done as much as he did in the 56 years of his life, despite his illnesses, is a marvel.

The praxeological sciences can be approached from four viewpoints:

1. *authoritarian* (as Scripture);
2. *a priori*, from general principles which insist on the internal consistency of the ideas;
3. description and measurement, that is, putting "facts" in the form of statistics; or
4. *psychological or historical interpretation*, that is, that you "interpret" events in history.

Weber is a sociologist utilizing especially method number (4). He is a great theorist about events. For him the question was: What was the psychology and the proper interpretation of historical events?

A man adopts a method or a program in life which fits his make-up and at which he can do well. Weber was a brilliant interpreter of many historical events. It gave him an opportunity to show the imaginativeness and penetration of his mind. It was his *métier*.

What was Max Weber's explanation — interpretation — of the rise of Capitalism in the Western World? In the remainder of this issue we shall be tracing Weber's thought on that question.

The *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* has this to say about Weber's ideas:

[Weber] reached the conclusion that Calvinism, on the basis of the idea of *calling* as developed by Luther, had elevated this worldly asceticism* to an idea of conduct and that the obligation of the godly man to pursue this ideal constituted one of the main springs of Capitalism. More specifically this worldly asceticism tended to identify spiritual salvation with business success and so created the Capitalist spirit.

In plain words, the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* says that Weber says that Calvinism "created the capitalist spirit."

From this, however, nobody should infer that Weber was otherwise an admirer of Calvinism. Weber (in the frequent pose of sociologists, of being pure scientists) declared he was approaching his analysis of the relation of religions to capitalism without "value judgments" regarding the merits of Catholicism, Lutheranism or Calvinism. In a way it must be admitted that Weber is not obviously partisan in his viewpoint; he did not choose between the various branches of Christianity. But his basic viewpoint is an unscriptural set of ethics — that one should love the neighbor *more than* himself. Because under true Calvinism and genuine capitalism that principle is rejected, and the rule is, Thou shalt love the neighbor *as thyself* (not more than thyself), Weber is essentially hostile to both. He holds to the socialist principle, Thou shalt love the neighbor more than thyself.

The *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* says of Weber:

The search on the part of the German youth movement for a substitute for religion drew from him the observation that the doors of the church were still open to those who could not live without faith and were willing to sacrifice their intellectual integrity.

For Weber, acceptance of scriptural standards as norms entailed the "sacrifice of intellectual integrity." He was then *at heart* no admirer of Calvinism nor any other brand of Christianity.

*The term, this-worldly asceticism, will be defined later.

In what follows we shall summarize ideas in two books by Weber:

1. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 284 pages, translated from the German by Talcott Parsons in 1930, and published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. The original German text first published in 1904-5 had the title *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*. This English translation has an interesting foreword by the well-known Englishman, R. H. Tawney.

2. *General Economic History*, 382 pages, translated by Professor Frank H. Knight of the University of Chicago, published in 1927 by Greenberg, Publisher, Inc., and reprinted by The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois in 1950. This is a posthumous work of Weber. In fact, this history is really compiled from student notes taken during Weber's lectures. These lectures were given shortly before his death.

Weber, considering his nonacceptance of Christianity in any form, nevertheless (it must be conceded) does not speak discourteously of Calvinism, Lutheranism or Catholicism. He does attribute the *spirit of capitalism* to certain ideas which he declares are peculiar to Calvinism. We shall, in summarizing and appraising Weber's ideas, conform to his unobjectionable way of describing the various manifestations of Christianity. Nothing that is written in what follows is intended even remotely as a criticism of the great Catholic and Lutheran churches, of which in the large we are great admirers.

fn

Tawney's Foreword To Weber's Book

Richard Henry Tawney was born in Calcutta, India, in 1880 and as far as we know is still living. He is described in encyclopedias as an English educator and economist.

Early in his teaching career he became interested in the problem of education of the working class, and he eventually became president of the Workers' Educational Association. He long held the chair of economic history at the University of London. He has served on many government boards and commissions.

Tawney has written various books. The one for which he is famous is entitled, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*. Readers will note that this title is similar to Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

Tawney may be considered the English counterpart of the German, Weber. The books of both men are devoted to the relation of Calvinism to the rise of Capitalism. Tawney is especially interested in the relationship in *English* history between religion and capitalism. This naturally would make him interested in the Puritans, because the great rise of English capitalism occurred under the Puritans.

Although similar, there is an important difference between Weber's and Tawney's books. Tawney's book has an additional idea. It is that the Puritan conscience was constantly uneasy about this capitalism business. The purpose of Tawney's book is to discredit the relationship between Calvinism and capitalism. Yes, the relationship (he admits) was there. But not only is capitalism an evil and a mistake, but the consciences of those very Calvinist builders of capitalism writhed in an agony of uncertainty about the moral soundness of those very ideas which were the driving force behind the growth of capitalism. Tawney appears to endeavor to stir up the same anxieties in the minds of the remnants of true Calvinists who are left. That is his only plausible purpose.

Tawney has a fine literary style, great learning and subtle suppression of strong statements. The effect of his book is the greater, understatement always being more forceful than overstatement. But despite the rhetorical effectiveness of Tawney's work, it should be looked on as a completely biased piece of propaganda. Tawney is an avowed socialist, hostile to capitalism.

History is never unbiassed. A historian always must select from the immense mass of data that is available. He selects what he thinks significant or what proves his thesis. Tawney's thesis is that the Puritans had an uneasy conscience about business and capitalism. He selects his data accordingly.

One would expect that modern Calvinists would be skeptical and unsympathetic to the thesis of Tawney, an avowed and aggressive socialist. But that is an error. At Calvin College

Tawney's work is considered unbiassed, objective history, even though Tawney is a propagandizing socialist. One reason for this is that at Calvin College the "Protestant ethic" which is professed is no longer the protestant ethic of the great days of Calvinism in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. A second reason is that at Calvin College they do not understand that Tawney is endeavoring to discredit the idea that Calvinism led (properly) to capitalism, because if Calvinism does properly lead to capitalism, Calvinism cannot lead to socialism. It is socialism that Tawney wants. To get religion (in this case, Calvinism) behind the program for socialism, it is necessary to establish that Calvinism should never have led to capitalism. The most Tawney could try to establish is that the *conscience* of Puritans rebelled. He selects (biasses) his quotations to that end.

In Tawney's *Foreword* to Weber's book he summarizes Weber's main thesis as follows. It could not be simpler and better expressed.

The pioneers [the Calvinists] of the modern economic order were, he [Weber] argues, *parvenus*, [upstarts] who elbowed their way to success in the teeth of the established aristocracy of land and commerce. The tonic that braced them for the conflict was a new conception of religion, which taught them to regard the pursuit of wealth as, not merely an advantage, but a duty. This conception welded into a disciplined force the still feeble *bourgeoisie*, heightened its energies, and cast a halo of sanctification round its convenient vices. What is significant, in short, is not the strength of the motive of economic self-interest, which is the commonplace of all ages and demands no explanation. It is the change of moral standards which converted a natural frailty into an ornament of the spirit, and cannonized as the economic virtues habits which in earlier ages had been denounced as vices. The force which produced it was the creed associated with the name of Calvin. Capitalism was the social counterpart of Calvinist theology.

That is Weber's thesis admirably summarized by Tawney:

1. The Calvinists (the Reformed and the Puritans) were newcomers, *parvenus*, people from below who forged their way to the top. They did this against odds — the established aristocracy and the financial and commercial hangers-on of the government.

2. The pursuit of wealth in the estimate of the Calvinists was not only an advantage, but a *duty*.

3. It was not economic motivation merely that explains the rise of capitalism because all people have economic motivation, but it was the new idea of morality, namely, that *economic motivation* was "an ornament of the spirit" and not a human frailty.

4. What other ages had considered vices about collecting wealth the Calvinists "canonized as the economic virtues."

5. In short, capitalism is nothing more than the "social counterpart of Calvinist theology."

What somewhat amuses us is that some things here said apply largely to PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM. Consider our Declaration 5 which is widely attacked. This Declaration, although written before we had read Weber, is exactly in the spirit of the Calvinism which Weber describes.

(a) Promote confidence that prosperity obtained in a free market society is the result of obedience to the law of God; and (b) discontinue all apologies for that prosperity and all policies which will undermine that prosperity.

Consider what Tawney quotes from Scripture in the following quotation from his foreword to the English translation of Weber's book:

The Calvinism, both of England and Holland, in the seventeenth century, had found its way to a different position. [Tawney had just mentioned the early attempted socialism by the Puritans in Massachusetts, which collapsed; see PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM, February 1955, pages 35-37.] It [Calvinism in England and Holland] had discovered a compromise in which a juster balance

was struck between prosperity and salvation, and while retaining the theology of the master [Calvin himself] it repudiated his scheme of social ethics. Persuaded that "godliness hath the promise of this life, as well as the life to come," it resisted with sober intransigence [stubborn determination], the interference in matters of business both of the state and of the divines. It is this second, individualistic phase of Calvinism, rather than the remorseless rigours of Calvin himself, which may plausibly be held to have affinities with the temper called by Weber "the spirit of Capitalism."

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM should long ago have quoted in support of our Declaration 5 the text quoted by Tawney "godliness hath the promise of *this life*, as well as the life to come" (I Timothy 4:8b).

Readers will now understand the famous thesis of Weber about Calvinism and capitalism. There are all kinds of refinements to the idea but the main idea has now been plainly stated.

It is because PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM is in this great Calvinist tradition that its ideas are disliked in some quarters in the Christian Reformed church. This is proof how greatly the temper of the age has already transformed that brand of Calvinism. What is true in this regard in this country, is doubly true in the Netherlands.
fn

Are Calvinists Prosperous?

Weber in footnote 5 to Chapter I of his book, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, in alleged proof that there is a relationship between Calvinism and prosperity, presents the following statistics:

For instance, in 1895 in Baden there was taxable capital available for the tax on returns from capital:

Per 1,000 Protestants 954,000 marks

Per 1,000 Catholics 589,000 marks

It is true that the Jews, with over four millions per 1,000, were far ahead of the rest. (Page 188.)

Weber also attempts to show that Protestants are more determined to obtain an education. The figures in total are as follows; they apply again to Baden in 1895.

	Percent of Population	Percent Getting Voluntary Advanced Education
Protestants	37	48
Catholics	61	42
Jews	2	10
	100	100

In his Chapter I Weber makes the following allegations regarding the Germany of his time.

1. Business leaders, owners of capital, higher grades of skilled labor, higher technically and commercially trained help are "overwhelmingly Protestant."

2. Many Catholic students taking advanced education do so in order to enter religious vocations. Protestant students generally seek a higher education for business, technical and professional purposes.

Weber makes remarks as follows about the effect of Calvinism on social stratification in previous ages:

Even the Spaniards knew that heresy (i.e., the Calvinism of the Dutch) promoted trade, and this coincides with the opinions which Sir William Petty [English representative in the Netherlands during the rise of Calvinism in Holland] expressed in his discussion of the reasons for the capitalistic development of the Netherlands. (Page 43.)

* * *

Montesquieu says (*Esprit des Lois*, Book XX, Chapter 7) of the English [especially, the Puritans] that they "had progressed the farthest of all peoples of the world in three important things: in piety, in commerce, and in freedom." Is it not possible that their commercial superiority and their adaption to free political institutions are connected in some way with that record of piety which Montesquieu ascribes to them? (Page 45.)

The last sentence quoted is a rhetorical question by Weber. Weber's point is that prosperity and freedom were products of *piety* (not *piosity*). We agree with him. fn

What Is Capitalism?

We shall consider, in what follows, the key terms in the title of Weber's book, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. These terms are (1) *capitalism*, (2) the *spirit* of capitalism, and (3) the *Protestant ethic* by which Weber means particularly the Calvinist brand.

What is *capitalism*?

Weber denies that capitalism is the impulse to acquisition or the pursuit of gain. He says everybody has that impulse — physicians, prostitutes, nobles, artists, etc. He declares that it is naive to call the mere "love of gain" capitalism. He writes:

We will define a capitalistic economic action as one which rests on the expectation of profit by the utilization of opportunities for exchange, that is on (formally) peaceful chances of profit. Acquisition by force (formally and actually) follows its own particular laws, and it is not expedient, however little one can forbid this, to place it in the same category with action which is, in the last analysis, oriented to profits from exchange. (Pages 17-18.)

In this definition Weber mentions two basic ideas — *exchange* and *peaceful chances*. The idea of exchange or trade is clear enough. The controlling term is *peaceful chances*. This unusual term justifies the following explanation:

1. Capitalism excludes coercion, because if there is coercion the transaction cannot really be peaceful. This requires then obedience to the Sixth Commandment, Thou shalt not kill (coerce).

2. Number (1) is a negative, but the inevitable positive which must go with it is *freedom*. If you are not coerced, you are free. If trade is not coerced, it is free. If it is free to all parties, it is peaceful.

3. Then there are *chances*. A transaction may return a profit or no profit. But capitalism requires that the players in the game take their chances. They cannot be guaranteed a profit. They cannot be insured against their mistakes. The public cannot protect the participants in economic activity from responsibility for individual acts, their own chances. This is based on the Eighth Commandment, Thou shalt not steal. This, too, is negative, but the positive is that the neighbor must have a *right* to his property, if it is *wrong* to take it away from him by force, theft or fraud. But if he loses his property by folly or slackness, that is another matter. He took his *chances*. When he lost under those conditions there was no breach of *peaceful chances*.

Note that Weber rejects entirely the idea that capitalism is based on force. He says that "acquisition by force follows its own particular [and different] laws."

Weber's definition of capitalism naturally excludes communism, socialism and interventionism. Communism openly employs force and denies right of private ownership. Socialism employs less force but denies the right of private ownership. The difference between the two is merely a difference in the openness of the force employed.

Interventionism is not basically different from communism and socialism. The force it uses is disguised under the cloak of *legality*, and the range it covers does not deny the validity of private property, but it provides for the regulation of the *use of property*. It is exactly the *use* of property in which its value to an individual resides. By restricting the use, the ownership is proportionately nullified. Interventionism is a disguised attack on private property. (Interventionism is the prevailing doctrine of members in the Christian Reformed church and Calvinistic churches in the Netherlands.) Interventionism is not capitalism nor *basically* a degree of capitalism. Interventionism is basically a degree of socialism, and a stepping stone to full socialism. *Interventionism is coercion disguised under the form of legality but coercion nevertheless.*

For space reasons we shall not give more complete and satisfactory definitions of capitalism by famous economists as Ludwig

von Mises and others. We are here working on the basis of Weber's terms. For our limited purposes the definition is adequate. Weber sets up a *free market* by his use of the term *peaceful chances*. fn.

What Is The Protestant Ethic?

A. What Is The Protestant Ethic In Regard To The Antithesis?

By the term *Protestant Ethic* Weber primarily refers to *Calvinist* ethics. He does not extensively include Lutheran ethics under the term. Lutheran ethics are, in Weber's view, a cross-breed between Catholic ethics and Calvinist ethics. Weber writes that the Catholics and Lutherans have a "common repugnance" to the "ethical peculiarities of Calvinism" (page 87). For a Calvinist the "relationship of religious life and earthly activity" are different from that of the Lutheran or Catholic.

Both Catholicism and Lutheranism preceded Calvinism, and Calvinism is not understandable except in relation to Catholicism and Lutheranism.

Weber has a whole series of terms which have special meanings and these terms need to be understood, terms such as *asceticism*, *this-worldly asceticism*, *other-worldly asceticism*, *calling*, *magic*, *prophecy*, *brotherly love*, *glory of God*, *rational*.

We shall explain the terms, *asceticism*, *other-worldly asceticism* and *this-worldly asceticism*, against a Catholic background. We shall explain the term *calling* against a Lutheran background.

Catholic And Calvinist Ideas On Asceticism

One of the big issues in the Christian Reformed church is the *antithesis* — the difference between "unbelievers" and "believers" and the opposition the believer is expected to show against the "world," and the requirement that he be separate from it.

This antithesis idea has many facets, for example, the demand that there be separate labor organizations for "believers" from "unbelievers." If the idea is not entirely or not even predominantly withdrawal from the "world," it does involve opposition to the

"world" or, as a minimum, testimony against the "world." Involved also is the whole concept of "corporate responsibility," a very vague idea, but it must have some meaning.

Devout people believe that they have the calling to be a "holy and a separate people" unspotted from the world.

If the "church" is to be different from the "world," and if the "church" is to be a "salting salt" and a "leaven" in this world, something must be done and certain actions must be taken by the Christian which make him different from the non-Christian. This involves testimony, difference, and maybe withdrawal from the world.

Asceticism is a specific manifestation of the idea of the antithesis. It is a restraint, a withdrawal or something which represents a religious ideal for the glory of God and the soul's welfare.

Weber makes a basic distinction between *this-worldly asceticism* and *other-worldly asceticism*. He designates the asceticism of Catholicism to be basically *other-worldly*, but the asceticism of Calvinism to be *this-worldly*, or for short *worldly asceticism*.

The idea of "*worldly*" asceticism by Calvinists sounds self-contradictory. How can a man be ascetic and have that be an asceticism which puts one into the "world," right into the maelstrom of life?

The Catholic *other-worldly asceticism* was manifested by withdrawal into monasteries and the separation of the clergy from the laity. The ideal was a withdrawal and separation from the world. There was virtue and merit in *that*.

Weber declares that that is also in part the idea of Lutheranism.

But the spirit of Calvinism, he declared, was wholly different. In this case the ideal was to be different while *in* the world; instead of withdrawing, to be in the vortex of practical, everyday activity. Do not *withdraw from* the world, be *different in* the world. Summarizing, to withdraw (into monasteries, for example) is an *other-worldly asceticism*; to participate in the world but to be different from the world is a *this-worldly asceticism*.

Weber considers the *this-worldly asceticism* of Calvinism to be an intense asceticism — active, distinct, aggressive, leavening, practical, noncontemplative, *this-worldly*.

On this basis of *this-worldly asceticism* the Calvinist would strive for the glory of God and the extension of the church by *activity in the affairs of this world*. On that premise there is nothing wrong with being heavily engrossed in practical affairs, say in manufacturing and commerce or in the arts or what have you.

There is only one way fully to impress the importance of this idea. A Calvinist was not to be a monk in a monastery, but a monk everywhere, all the time, in every activity of life. This is probably as good a figure of speech as could be devised; imagine a man very active in matters pertaining to everyday existence, working, buying, selling, meeting people, participating in every proper activity in this world and not trying to withdraw from it, but nevertheless separate, distinct, different from the "world" around him, as a monk in a monastery is different from an ordinary man. Calvinists then are peripatetic (walking) monks.

A little reflection will make clear to members of the Christian Reformed church that on the antithesis question they are vacillating between the *this-worldly asceticism* of traditional Calvinism and the *other-worldly asceticism* of separating from the world. The antithesis for many has become mostly *separate organization* from the world, rather than bold activity *in* the world. The emphasis is on the husk of *organization*, rather than on the kernel of activity (*principles*).

We are well aware that lax Calvinists do not even like the idea of the antithesis because *their own principles are the principles of the "world."* They really belong *with* the world. PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM does not feel that it belongs with the "world" nor is it keen about separate organizations such as special unions or monasteries. We believe in testimony *in* the world. But this means for us something very different from a typical modern Calvinist. Practically no Calvinist in the Christian Reformed church testifies today against *public* evils. Calvinists generally do not even recognize public evils *as evils*. They cannot be Calvinist "monks" striding through the world, because they are not really different

themselves from the "world." As a classic case take the Christian Labor Association whose program (except for open violence) is identical with that of all other unions. The difference — the "antithesis" — is manifested in *organization* rather than in *policy* (principles). The difference in *organization* is the less-important difference. It is differences in principles that are most significant; such differences hardly exist.

B. What Is The Protestant Ethic In Regard To Calling In Life?

Luther, according to Weber, was the first to develop broadly the idea of *calling*. The Calvinists took the idea over and made it even more prominent in their lives. On this *calling* idea they grabbed the ball and ran the whole field with it.

What is this *calling*?

It is not in any way a mystical sense of a divine calling to be a missionary or a preacher. It is, instead, merely an attitude toward *any* job or work you have. Your *calling* is how you view and do your life work whether you deliberately selected it and like it, or whether you just fell into it and you have it by force of circumstances. It is not the job itself but the principles according to which you do the job.

Weber defines *calling* as follows:

1. *Calling* generally is a "religious conception; that [is], a task set by God" (page 79). Luther added something to this very old idea of *calling*, according to Weber:

But at least one thing was unquestionably new: the valuation of the fulfillment of duty in worldly affairs as the highest form which the moral activity of the individual could assume. . . . The only way of living acceptably to God was not to surpass worldly morality in monastic asceticism, but solely through the fulfillment of the obligations imposed on the individual by his position in the world. That was his calling. (Page 80.)

Note the strong language Weber uses, to wit: "duty in *worldly* affairs was (for the Protestant) the *highest* form of moral activity." Both Luther and the Calvinists are said by Weber to hold this idea.

2. "... every legitimate calling has exactly the same worth in the sight of God" (page 81). If this idea which Weber includes as a basic ingredient of the idea of *calling* is correct, then all worldly activities (except the immoral) are pleasing in the sight of God. This is a natural consequence of devaluation of life in a monastery. If there is no special merit in living there, merit must be manifested in the world itself. Weber wrote about Luther's idea:

The monastic life is not only quite devoid of value as a means of justification before God, but he [Luther] also looks upon its renunciation of the duties of this world as the product of selfishness, withdrawing from temporal obligations. In contrast, labour in a calling appears to him as an outward expression of brotherly love. This he proves by the observation that the division of labour forces every individual to work for others, but his viewpoint is highly naive, forming almost a grotesque contrast to Adam Smith's well-known statements on the same subject." (Page 81.)

Regular readers will immediately realize that PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM follows Luther (by the later Adam Smith route) in regard to the idea that the division of labor *accompanied by real freedom of exchange* is the outstanding this-worldly manifestation of brotherly love. (But if the *freedom* of exchange is hindered by state interventionism this program of brotherly love is partly frustrated.)

* * *

So much for the background in the rich history of Catholicism and the new vigour of Lutheranism. From this point onward the Calvinists walk the further path more or less alone. And it is this extreme of Calvinism to which both Catholics and Lutherans were declared by Weber to have a "common repugnance."

It should be remembered that Weber is talking about "ideal" types, that is, the really typical types. Some Catholics have held or now hold these ideas commonly held by old Calvinists. Some Calvinists (then and now) essentially are sympathetic to Catholic views (as the separatists today among the Calvinists). Lutherans, too, are of all types, some with a Calvinist and others with a Catholic tinge to their ideas. We come now to the *typical* Calvinist of the Golden Age of Calvinism, as described by Weber.

C. What Is The Protestant Ethic In Regard To The Glory Of God?

It is one thing to reject *other-worldly asceticism*; it is another thing to value all the activities of life as a *calling*; but it is still another idea to consider that you are glorifying God just by the exercise of your ordinary, everyday calling.

In Christian Reformed churches some ministers preach that you must so work in your daily work that you *also* glorify God; you supplement your actual daily work by a mental attitude and it is by what you supplement that you glorify God. This is not the real, traditional Calvinist idea; that idea was that *by doing the work itself* you were glorifying God.

Let us follow Weber's analysis:

1. You must WORK. Weber writes about Calvinism:

Not leisure and enjoyment, but only activity serves to increase the glory of God, according to the definite manifestations of His will.

Waste of time is thus the first and in principle the deadliest of sins. The span of human life is infinitely short and precious to make sure of one's own election. Loss of time through sociability, idle talk, luxury, even more sleep than is necessary for health, six to at most eight hours, is worthy of absolute moral condemnation. (Pages 157-158.)

Weber says that the Calvinists about whom he was writing considered *work* to be to "the glory of God, according to the manifestations of His will."

2. There is a second facet to living for the glory of God. That facet consists in the *avoidance of waste* and in *frugal and simple living*. These two things are also, according to Weber, part of the living to the glory of God. The *avoidance of waste* honors God by not wasting what He has provided in nature; this is an obvious relationship of men to things, but by the character of that relationship, by conservation of scarce things, God is glorified.

3. Weber writes: "The elected Christian is in the world only to increase this glory of God by fulfilling His commandments to the best of his ability" (page 108). The glory of God does not consist, in other words, in loud "Amens," nor in the sacrifice of goats or bullocks, but in obedience to the commandments. As Samuel said to Saul 3,000 years ago:*

And Samuel said, Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as idolatry and teraphim. Because thou hast rejected the word of Jehovah, he hath also rejected thee from being king. (I Samuel 15:22-23.)

**Important note:* Readers are requested to suspend judgment regarding what we *fully* mean by the *glory of God*. What some people mean by the *glory of God* we consider inadequate.

In this connection we place the problem in the perspective which it must have in this context. This is done as follows:

1. *To live to the glory of God* can be viewed subjectively or objectively; *subjectively*, when considering the attitude of the mind and will toward God; *objectively*, when considering human *action*—that which is actually done. (Human *action* is the field of *praxeology*; *praxeology* includes the social sciences but is broader than a mere *social* approach to action. Our *praxeological* approach is not *social* only, but takes into account the relation of men to (1) God and (2) things, as well as (3) to men.) We are operating in PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM in the field of *praxeology*, and not in the field of *psychology* or *subjective motivations*. We are considering only the glory of God in the field of human *action*.

2. In the field of *human action*, we believe that two categories will cover everything pertaining to the glory of God. These two categories are (a) talk; and (b) conduct, or in different language, (a) testimony and (b) obedience. Although *testimony* is human action, and so is part of *praxeology*, it is the part which we have, according to previous statements, left mostly to the field of religion proper, and to gospel testimony, and individual and group manifestations of praise to God. (We shall cover this field intermittently and with a proselyting purpose.) Our real field in PROGRESSIVE CAL-

Electricity is measured both in amperes and volts. The amperes are, say, the quantity of electricity and the volts are the driving force behind the amperes. The ideas just outlined, namely, *work* and *conservation* and *thrift* (the amperes), describe characteristics of fundamental value to business. What made Calvinists work so hard in exercising these virtues? What gave them the voltage to do it?

Weber says that the source of the tremendous voltage which Calvinists had in regard to *work*, *conservation* and *thrift* was the Calvinist doctrine of predestination. Jumping the intermediate links, what he is declaring is that belief in predestination makes you do things that are to the glory of God, and which, incidentally of course, *will make you prosperous*. Who would think of linking predestination and prosperity? PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM *has* received protests against the idea that obeying the law of God will make you prosperous. But Weber goes further; he says there is an inseparable relationship between predestination and capitalism. Weber's reasoning is really interesting. It goes as follows:

1. Calvinists believe in election to salvation, and reprobation to damnation. This activity of God is unconditional, according to His sovereign good pleasure.

2. But the idea has its grim as well as its happy phases. You cannot "elect" yourself. You cannot earn your own salvation. *What if you are not "elected"?*

VINISM is the field of conduct, that is, the field of *obedience* or *disobedience to God*.

On the question which of the two, *testimony* or *obedience*, is the more important relative to the glory of God, we follow Scripture. Scripture requires *both* talk and conduct appropriate to the glory of God, but when it chooses between the two, it definitely rates *conduct* higher than *talk*, and *obedience* more than *testimony*. That is what Samuel told Saul, as we are quoting in the text.

Max Weber, too, is not writing about *talk*, but about *conduct*. We agree with Weber in what he says Old Calvinists considered to be the glory of God in respect to their own *actions*. The program of the Old Calvinists consisted in living in *obedience* to God, because (we assume) they too considered that to be the higher way to glorify God.

We petition readers to avoid saying that we consider the glory of God to be only obedience and not testimony also, or that we are denying the significance of the *attitude* of the person, his motivation, etc.

With Scripture generally, with Samuel in particular, with Old Calvinists, and with Weber as he interprets Old Calvinists, PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM agrees completely and unqualifiedly.

3. That question poses an intense psychological problem for a Calvinist. How have confidence that you are "elected"? Men, according to Weber's approach to the problem, cannot be confident in "election" just because they "believe" it. The belief will wither and die unless it is cultivated and nourished in some way. How nourish confidence that you are elected, and get away from stoical fatalism and unbelief?

4. To that question Weber said the answer for the Calvinist consisted in *actively, aggressively working in this world*. That would not earn salvation. That is not possible. Salvation is by grace. But it would show thankfulness for grace. By showing thankfulness for grace God would be glorified. And what provided the supplementary or primary motivation or voltage for this? The answer, according to Weber, is that the Calvinist *psychologically needed* that activity (work, thrift, conservation, obedience to the law of God in *this* life) to assure himself of his salvation. And *that* is why he was so industrious, thrifty, and modest in living. God was glorified by *acts* in this life, in the ordinary workaday world, but Calvinists subjectively needed that activity in order to keep up their morale in regard to election.

Weber expresses his views about this psychological problem as follows:

In the place of the humble sinners to whom Luther promises grace if they trust themselves to God in penitent faith are bred those self-confident saints whom we can rediscover in the hard Puritan merchants of the heroic age of capitalism and in isolated instances down to the present. On the other hand, in order to attain that self-confidence intense worldly activity is recommended as the most suitable means. It and it alone disperses religious doubts and gives the certainty of grace. (Pages 111-112.)

And, so Weber concludes, dogmatic and austere belief in predestination was really the psychological foundation of the greatest economic development the world has ever seen — capitalism. And capitalism is a by-product of trying to live to the glory of God!

But a danger arises. Wealth and prosperity result in worldliness. Riches make for independence, and independence weakens the religious instinct. What may the answer be to that? On that subject Weber quotes John Wesley, founder of Methodism; (Weber considers Methodism, Pietism and the Baptist groups to be in the Calvinist tradition). This is what Wesley wrote (*italics as in original*):

"I fear, wherever riches have increased, the essence of religion has decreased in the same proportion. Therefore I do not see how it is possible, in the nature of things, for any revival of true religion to continue long. For religion must necessarily produce both industry and frugality, and these cannot but produce riches. But as riches increase, so will pride, anger, and love of the world in all its branches. How then is it possible that Methodism, that is, a religion at heart, though it flourishes now as a green bay tree, should continue in this state? For the Methodists in every place grow diligent and frugal; consequently they increase in goods. Hence they proportionately increase in pride, in anger, in the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and the pride of life. So, although the form of religion remains, the spirit is swiftly vanishing away. Is there no way to prevent this — this continual decay of pure religion? We ought not to prevent people from being diligent and frugal; *we must exhort all Christians to gain all they can, and to save all they can; that is, in effect, to grow rich.*"

After quoting Wesley, Weber goes on to say:

There follows the advice that those who gain all they can and save all they can should also give all they can, so that they will grow in grace and lay up a treasure in heaven. It is clear that Wesley here expresses, even in detail, just what we have been trying to point out. (Pages 175-176.)

Space limitations prevent us from developing further Weber's idea that the Calvinist's need to glorify God, by obeying the commandments in *this* life, was induced by the need to convince himself that he was really "elected."

D. What Is The Protestant Ethic In Regard To Loving The Neighbor As Thyself?

Not only does Weber outline the ideas of sixteenth-seventeenth century Calvinists in regard to the *glory of God* as being of a kind with which PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM in some respects agrees, but he also describes the old Calvinist idea of *brotherly love* as being of a kind with which we also agree. Not only do we agree, but we somewhat enviously admit that Weber employs a phrase which is in some respects more descriptive of our idea of brotherly love than that which we have used. We shall now outline what Weber considered to be the real substance of the old Calvinist idea of *brotherly love*. It should be kept in mind that by manifesting this kind of brotherly love the older Calvinists considered that they were glorifying God.

Weber wrote as follows:

It seems at first a mystery how the undoubted superiority of Calvinism in social organization can be connected with this tendency to tear the individual away from the close ties with which he is bound to this world. But, however strange it may seem, it follows from the peculiar form which the Christian brotherly love was forced to take under the pressure of the inner isolation of the individual through the Calvinistic faith. In the first place it follows dogmatically. The world exists to serve the glorification of God and for that purpose alone. The elected Christian is in the world only to increase this glory of God by fulfilling His commandments to the best of his ability. But God requires social achievement of the Christian because He wills that social life shall be organized according to His commandments, in accordance with that purpose. The social activity of the Christian in the world is solely activity in *majorem gloriam Dei*. This character is hence shared by labour in a calling which serves the mundane life of the community. Even in Luther we found specialized labour in callings justified in terms of brotherly love. But what for him remained an uncertain, purely intellectual suggestion became for the Calvinists a characteristic element in their ethical system. Brotherly

love, since it may only be practised for the glory of God and not in the service of the flesh, is expressed in the first place in the fulfillment of the daily tasks given by the *lex naturae*; and in the process this fulfillment assumes a peculiarly objective and impersonal character, that of service in the interest of the rational organization of our social environment. For the wonderfully purposeful organization and arrangement of this cosmos is, according both to the revelation of the Bible and to natural intuition, evidently designed by God to serve the utility of the human race. This makes labour in the service of impersonal social usefulness appear to promote the glory of God and hence to be willed by Him. (Pages 108-109.)

Readers are requested to note the following in regard to the question Weber is discussing:

1. Calvinism resulted in "undoubted superiority in social organization."* This influence of the Calvinist was despite his interest in the future life and despite his intense individualism and his resistance and even disrespect for civil authority. That Calvinism promoted a "superior social organization" is a very fine tribute to Calvinism.

2. The really important idea in the long quotation is that, *in the Calvinist tradition, brotherly love has a "peculiarly objective and impersonal character."* This is the highly descriptive phrase describing *brotherly love* which we wish we had coined or even sensed. Readers are informed regarding our intense suspicion and dislike of *sentimental* brotherly love which creates a "community" in the sense that various educational leaders think of "community."

Now it must be admitted that it sounds contradictory to describe brotherly love as *impersonal* and *objective*. But that apparent incongruity (contradiction) exists only because love has first been defined sentimentally as an *obligation to like*. As we have defined brotherly and neighborly love in PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM, such love is "peculiarly objective and impersonal."

*A free market.

3. And what fruit does this "peculiarly objective and impersonal" brotherly love yield? Weber answers that it yields a unique "service in the interest of the rational organization of our social environment." In Weber's dictionary of words, *rational* means *suited to the end, logical, effective*. When, then, Weber talks about a "rational organization of our social environment" he means a social organization that contributes to human happiness and prosperity. In other words, the *correct* idea of brotherly love, although impersonal and objective and no more, promotes happiness and prosperity in this life.

4. Weber goes further. This *impersonal and objective brotherly love* makes business — buying, selling, producing, trading — "appear to promote the glory of God and hence be willed by Him." Of course, this buying, selling, producing and trading must be in accordance with the Second Table to the Law, that is *completely free*, except that there may be no wronging of the neighbor by violence (Sixth Commandment), adultery (Seventh Commandment), theft (Eighth Commandment), fraud (Ninth Commandment), nor coveting (Tenth Commandment).

Weber ascribes the greatest importance to this idea that *brotherly love* should be impersonal and objective. In the famous last chapter of his *General Economic History*, previously cited, he writes:

The typical antipathy of Catholic ethics, and following that the Lutheran, to every capitalistic tendency, rests essentially on the repugnance of the impersonality of relations within a capitalist economy. It is this fact of impersonal relations which places certain human affairs outside the church and its influence, and prevents the latter from penetrating them and transforming them along ethical lines. The relations between master and slave could be subjected to immediate ethical regulation; but the relations between the mortgage creditor and the property which was pledged for the debt, or between an endorser and the bill of exchange, would at least be exceedingly difficult if not impossible to moralize. The final consequence of the resulting position assumed by the church was that medieval economic ethics excluded higg-

ling, overpricing and free competition, and were based on the principle of just price and the assurance to everyone of a chance to live. (Pages 357-358.)

In this quotation mention is made of the hostility of great branches of Christianity to the specifically Calvinist idea of the impersonality of brotherly love. This explains in part the bitter attacks made on ideas on brotherly love presented in PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM. Further, the logical result of that kind of law of brotherly love is that higgling* about a price is perfectly justified and so also is free competition. In the Christian Labor Association, at Calvin College, in the Free University of Amsterdam, in the writings of Abraham Kuyper, in *The Banner*, on the pulpits in the Christian Reformed church, the free action of competition in the market place is often decried and criticized as unbrotherly, un-Christian, as a violation of the ideal of brotherly love. In its place, as Weber declares, there is substituted the idea of a "just price" and the "assurance to everyone of a chance to live."

What is a "just price"? Nobody knows. The ideas of a "just price" and a "fair price" *independent of free market activity* are utterly meaningless.** We would declare that God himself does not know and cannot know what a "just price" is, were it not that we feared offense would be taken at such a statement.

This is another instance in which we are astonishingly in agreement with the great Calvinism of the sixteenth-seventeenth century, as outlined by Weber.

In short, what Weber declares to be traditional Calvinism in regard to neighborly relations in the affairs of this world, we have laboriously defined in the February, March, April and May 1955 issues of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM, as the scriptural idea of *brotherly love*. The definition we gave is a definition which defines an "objective and impersonal" brotherly love. fn

*Americans customarily use the word, *haggling*.

**This requires extended explanation, for which space is lacking here.

Evaluation Of Weber's Thesis On Calvinism And Capitalism

When we read Weber's books we thought that Weber was writing about the psychology of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM. If Weber failed to understand Calvinism in its Golden Age, he certainly had a prophetic insight into the Calvinism of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM. We believe, however, that he perfectly understood the real psychology of Calvinism in its great career. The man's work in examining basic contemporary writings and his detailed research was monumental in scope. See the references in his book, and consider the preliminary reading required before he could possibly write the book.

It is not, however, Weber's laborious research which gets our greatest admiration; it is, instead, his interpretation of what Calvinism was in its heyday. That interpretation we consider correct and brilliant, almost the insight of genius.

Space is lacking to describe Weber's ideas further. There is a whole tapestry of brilliant insights and interpretations which we may in later issues describe piecemeal. Readers who really wish to understand Weber's ideas should certainly read his *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. We strongly recommend it; also the other book, his *General Economic History*, especially the last chapter.

When we strongly recommend this we have several thoughts in mind:

1. Readers will discover by comparing principles that modern Calvinism at the Free University of Amsterdam and at Calvin College is a radically different Calvinism from the Calvinism of the Reformation when it was in full career. "The apple has fallen today very far from the parent tree."

2. We believe that Weber did correctly interpret the "Protestant ethic." Without subscribing to all his ideas, his basic interpretation of what Calvinism really consisted is, in our opinion, descriptive and factual.

3. Weber, accepting personally the premises of socialism, could not, of course, be basically sympathetic to this Calvinism, this Protestant Ethic. Modern Calvinists who repudiate the Calvinism of the Golden Age of Calvinism have unconsciously

shifted to the socialist viewpoint when viewing old Calvinism critically. They agree with Weber in his viewpoint. We do not agree with Weber's viewpoint. We view Old Calvinism favorably because we are one with Old Calvinism. Weber and some Calvinists view Old Calvinism favorably because it produced a very effective, *rational*, prosperous social organization. But they would change that if they could by socialism in the case of Weber, and interventionism in the case of modern Calvinists.

4. PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM considers much of modern Calvinism not to be Calvinism at all, but a completely deviationist, heretical doctrine; (1) that comment can be substantiated by logic; (2) it is confirmed by history; (3) the bitter fruits will be harvested in the years to come. Modern Calvinism is already degenerative. Its protagonists are intellectual *epigoni*. They have never really understood Calvinism. They are merely prattlers of the prevailing ideas in the air, the present climate of thought. They adopt those ideas and piously baptize them as Calvinist. Their position is essentially that of the socialist, Tawney, whom they admire. There is in much modern Calvinism no "salting salt" whatever.

Concluding Remark

In 1904-1905 a German sociologist, by describing carefully of what sixteenth and seventeenth century Calvinism consisted, unwittingly anticipated what would be written in 1955-1956 in PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM. The connection consists in the fact that Old Calvinism and PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM are basically the same Calvinism.

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM LEAGUE

366 East 166th Street
South Holland, Illinois, U.S.A.

POSTMASTER:

If change of address on file, notify us on Form 3547 (for which postage is guaranteed).

If not deliverable, check reason in spaces below. Return postage guaranteed.

- ☐ Returned at sender's request
- ☐ No such Post Office in state named
- ☐ Moved—left no address
- ☐ Refused
- ☐ Unclaimed or unknown

BULK RATE
U. S. Postage
PAID
SOUTH HOLLAND, ILL.
Permit No. 12